

RECEIVED

EIS001775

KATHY ANDRIA

JAN 20 2000

1 MS. ANDRIA: My name is Kathy Andria. I represent the East St. Louis Community Action Network, a coalition of 20 neighborhood and community groups on the Illinois side of the river, an area through which it appears the majority of the waste is going to be shipped. [We just heard about this hearing Monday in the St. Louis Post Dispatch. Did you notify any Illinois papers? Did you notify any of the towns and cities the trains and trucks will be going through? Mayor Debra Powell from East St. Louis was here this morning. She said she had not been sent a notice, and yet thousands of tons of nuclear waste on trucks and trains will be going through her city. Did you really want the public here? Do you really want citizen comments? I wonder.

You say this is a public hearing designed to solicit public comments from citizens regarding so-called environmental impact statement, yet you did not have any copies of the EIS available for us to look at. When I learned of the hearing, I called to get a copy of the EIS and was told I could get a copy of it through the mail in 10 days, 10 days before the deadline for public comment. How can we even read a two-volume document containing several thousand pages, let alone digest it, do research and write our public comment? That's totally unacceptable.

For that reason, I hereby request a six-month extension of the deadline in order that both citizens and public officials can make an informed public comment. If your desire to get public comment is genuine, you will grant us an extension. If you do not, we will assume it is because you have already decided on your plan of action and this public hearing is just a sham.

2 [I sat through four hours of the hearing this morning eager to learn all I could about this project. What I did learn was alarming. Those who have knowledge of nuclear waste and know what questions to ask could not get their questions answered. You kept saying that congress did not require you to address a number of issues. When you were asked about transportation, you said congress told you you didn't have to address it. Excuse me? To us here in the midwest, this is about transportation, the transportation of deadly nuclear waste through our streets and cities where our families live, over the rivers where we get our drinking water.]

3 [What will happen if a train carrying the maximum load of nuclear waste derails over the Mississippi River and the casks are breached? When asked this question this morning a DOE spokesman kind of hemmed and hawed and said perhaps three cancer deaths would occur and finally admitted that the water would have "low level contamination." That is totally unacceptable and not believable.]

4 [Another person asked where was the EPA; not necessary for an environmental impact statement. Have you calculated the cost of training HAZMAT teams all along the travel route? Is it even possible for local HAZMAT teams to cope with a nuclear incident should a train derail or a truck overturn? How many HAZMAT teams would there have to be, spaced how far apart? Are the utility companies going to pay for that, are local governments, are the U.S. Taxpayers? Can local hospitals even cope with such a nuclear accident?

The federal government does not have a flawless record on projects involving technology and you know about the Mars probe, the Y2 glitch and the spy satellite, MTVE and the EPA and then we see the failure of a new advanced anti-missile system. A miscalculation or a glitch or an accident would not only be another failure in technology, it could mean disaster for an entire community, an entire region of the country such as the midwest, indeed the whole nation itself.]

5... [We think there is no choice. Leave the waste where it is. Continue to regulate it and enforce those responsible for its accumulation to store it safely and responsibly, and then as Lou Green suggested this

morning, start a second Manhattan Project. Gather the best minds in the world and come up with a way to destroy the nuclear waste we have now and render it harmless, but please, above all, stop the production of any new nuclear waste.

6

When I look at the handout that you gave us tonight, I see terms like "technically adequate" and "to the extent practicable." We're dealing with deadly nuclear waste. It sounds like it was written by a nuclear lobbyist. In fact, I learned tonight that two of your private consultants are with firms or have been with firms up until recently who also work for the nuclear industry and then I see that five of the sites that will be -- have their nuclear wastes shipped are DOE sites. It seems to me there's a conflict of interest here.

5
(cont'd.)

I ask you not to listen to the paid consultants of the nuclear industry, but to the voice of citizens who do not want to risk the future of this nation and that of our children. Now that we know what is on your horizon, we promise that we will see that our elected officials hear our voices above theirs.